

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/552,572</p>	<p>Applicant(s) SPEITH-HERFURTH ET AL</p>
	<p>Examiner Monique R. Jackson</p>	<p>Art Unit 1794</p>

All Participants:

(1) Monique R. Jackson.

(2) Ashley Pezzner.

Date of Interview: 21 October 2009

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:30am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Pending 103 rejections

Claims discussed:
All pending

Prior art documents discussed:
Murschall et al, Speith-Herfurth, Cretekos

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
A discussion took place with regards to the Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/09 in terms of the difference in cold-sealability of the instant film over the films of the prior art. The Applicant's attorney agreed to an Examiner's Amendment incorporating the term "cold-sealable" into claim 1 to clarify that the film comprising a cold sealing adhesive coating on its outer surface is cold sealable.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Monique R. Jackson/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)